

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***February 9-10, 2005
Elk Valley Rancheria
Crescent City, California***

FINAL MINUTES

February 9, 2005

Membership Attendance:

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Dave Bitts
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Neil Manji
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Not Represented
Del Norte County	Chuck Blackburn
Hoopa Valley Tribe	Michael Orcutt
Humboldt County	Jill Geist
Karuk Tribe	Ron Reed
Klamath County	Not represented
Klamath Tribes	Allen Foreman
National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries)	Irma Lagomarsino, Vice Chair
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)	Keith Wilkinson
Siskiyou County	Marcia Armstrong
Trinity County	Not represented
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	Julie Perrochet
U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI)	John Engbring, Chair
Yurok Tribe	Dave Hillemeier

Agendum 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair. Vice Chair is Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries

John Engbring called the meeting to session. He reported that he and Steve Thompson attended a recent Hatfield Working Group meeting and Steve mentioned several times that he had no idea how much impact the Task Force had in the Upper Basin. A lot of the Task Force work and coordination isn't heard in the outside world; the majority of coverage is negative. He continued that the Administration is still paying attention to the Basin. A number of projects in the Klamath Basin were identified in the President's 2006 budget. He asked that the Task Force be aware of this and view it as an opportunity to take advantage of.

John Engbring continued that the Klamath Act expires in 2006, and this year the Task Force will be focusing on wrapping up and allocating final funding. He has not authorized a Reauthorization Committee, but encouraged other Task Force members and the audience to discuss the future of the Task Force.

Mike Orcutt asked if the Task Force can write a letter asking the Administration about their position on the future of the Task Force. John Engbring said the group can make time to talk about recommendations to the Secretary. Irma Lagomarsino added that the funding and optimism in the Upper Basin is not being invested in the Lower Basin. NOAA Fisheries didn't receive the \$2 million that was in the President's budget, which we were hoping to use for coho studies in the Lower Basin. The money was also going to be used for restoration and studies on disease ecology. The drought condition in the Upper Basin is a big concern and challenge. She continued that she attended the conference with Bob Chadwick at the Yurok Headquarters and it was an intense, moving experience. There is another session in early March in Klamath Falls that she recommends people attend to witness the diverse groups coming together to listen to each other.

Agendum 2. Business

a. Approval of minutes

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve October minutes.

Seconded by Allen Foreman.

Motion carried. Mike Orcutt abstained.

b. Adoption of agenda

Dave Bitts suggested the Task Force talk about its future and the scope of what the Task Force and individuals can do about this. John Engbring said that will be added to the agenda. Neil Manji reported that he is not prepared to give an update on State recovery process.

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the agenda, as amended.

Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 3. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance

No Congressional staff in attendance.

Agendum 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)

Laurie Simons reported on the motions and assignments from the last meeting and reviewed the handouts in the packets. She reviewed the list of Task Force unspent and incomplete projects 3-years old and older (see agendum 4 handout) and the next steps for the brochure outlining Task Force accomplishments. She asked for design and content suggestions from the Task Force. Money from the 2005 budget will be used to fund this task. The TWG and the Task Force will approve the content before it is sent to the printer. Laurie Simons reported that the rest of the projects in the handout have been delayed or reports haven't been completed. This list is to let people know that these projects need to be completed and funds need to be spent.

Keith asked about the letter to Sue Ellen Wooldridge and if we could schedule discussion on this.

Assignment: Staff will include time for discussion on the letter from Sue Ellen Wooldridge regarding additional funding for future monitoring of fisheries in the Klamath Basin on the June agenda.

Agendum 5. Brief Updates and Announcements

a. Update on State recovery process (Phil Detrich)

Phil Detrich reported that the State recovery process is being carried out under California ESA. The Recovery Team is currently not meeting. The final document was finished one year ago and a number of team members are working with CDFG on an agricultural incidental take permit for coho in the Shasta/Scott Basin. The group is trying to negotiate under the state law and there have been discussions with Federal partners as well. Dave Hillemeier asked if the incidental take permit process is a transparent process. Phil Detrich wasn't sure. Marcia Armstrong added that there are going to be CEQA funding problems. The cost of CEQA documentation is estimated at \$500,000 per valley, which is a big problem

with the incidental take permit. In terms of the recovery process, the group has been discussing the Water Master Service. Half of the cost used to be collected from the landowners and California provided other half. In the last budget the total cost, plus fees was pushed to the landowners. A lot of the recovery for the Scott and Shasta depends on the Water Master shepherding the water through the stream for the fish. Without a Water Master, there are complications. Irma Lagomarsino said the NEPA process does provide for a public process, as does the ESA section 10. NOAA Fisheries has a responsibility to consult with the Tribes as well. We are working on the development on the incidental take permit.

Neil Manji asked that time be made available on the June Task Force agenda for CDFG to present the current status of the incidental take permit process.

Assignment: Staff will include a presentation by CDFG on the incidental take permit process on the June agenda. Neil Manji will provide a speaker.

b. Update on NOAA recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino)

Irma Lagomarsino stated that the independent population identification part of the recovery planning process is in the final stages. Greg Bryant will present the information at the Salmonid Restoration Recovery Planning Conference in March. The next step in the process is to do a viability assessment.

c. Status of lamprey petition (Phil Detrich)

Phil Detrich stated that in January 2003, the Fish & Wildlife Service received a petition to list three species of lamprey and one brook lamprey. The first stage in the listing review process is the 90 day finding. The 90 day finding was complete in the Fall of 2004. In September, the Fish & Wildlife Service found that information in the petition and our information do not constitute substantial information indicating that listing may be warranted, so the Fish & Wildlife Service will not be carrying forward a status review on the lamprey. The finding can be accessed online in the Federal Register. Neil Manji asked who the petitioners for lamprey were. Phil Detrich responded the Siskiyou Regional Education Project and ten other organizations.

d. Update on Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich)

Phil Detrich reviewed the responsibilities of the KFMC. Their focus is on harvest allocation and harvest modeling in order to make recommendations to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. The Council meets February Feb 23-24 in Eureka and again in March and April.

e. Update on Klamath Hydroelectric Project relicensing (Phil Detrich)

John Engbring stated that PacifiCorp's license to operate the Klamath Hydroelectric project expires in 2006. Recently, a series of settlement discussions have started to explore other options beyond the standard FERC process. The various parties are continuing to discuss various options. Discussions are confidential and are still preliminary. Phil Detrich added that the Final License Application was submitted to FERC last spring and the agencies submitted responses. The next step is for FERC to decide how to react to the responses from the agencies and whether to require PacifiCorp to conduct additional studies. The remaining schedule will develop based on the date the Additional Information Request is issued by FERC. After that decision, FERC will give a REA which triggers another commenting process and then FERC conducts its NEPA analysis.

f. Update on proposed Critical Habitat (Irma Lagomarsino)

Irma Lagomarsino reported that the comment period for critical habitat for salmonids has been extended. NOAA Fisheries proposed a rule in September and the final rule is now due August 15, 2005. Marcia

Armstrong said she thought it was ruled unenforceable. Irma Lagomarsino replied that it wasn't. She explained the process for determining critical habitat. The recent volume of press it has received is making it look like critical habitat has been cut, which is not necessarily true.

g. Conference on Science and the Northwest Forest Plan: Knowledge Gained Over a Decade, April 19-20, 2005 (Phil Detrich)

Phil Detrich stated that the Northwest Forest Plan has been in place for ten years and the agencies that manage the Forest Plan are planning a science conference in Portland. Information on the conference is in the handouts.

Agendum 6. Report on the status of Klamath River anadromous fisheries (Neil Manji)

Neil Manji introduced Sarah Borok, Fisheries Biologist out of Arcata. She will present 2004 Chinook fish returns compared to previous years. Sarah Borok began by saying that the megatable is not out yet and is still in the review process. She will only be talking about fall run Chinook salmon. The total Basin run is 88,777 fish, which is low. The predicted run was 98,600 fish. The adult portion was 79,043 fish, and 9,700 grills (a 10.9% grill return). Fall harvest was just around average. The sport harvest was slightly over on the Klamath and slightly under on Trinity side. Ron Reed stated that the Karuk Tribe was not part of that allocation, but we caught less than 100 fish. With the sun-setting Task Force, we have great concern for what the future holds for the Karuk Tribe.

Sarah Borok continued that hatchery returns were slightly less than average with 10,582 at Iron Gate and 12,399 at Trinity, which is also less than half of last year's return. The natural spawners for the entire Basin are under the floor for total escapement. We are 10,000 fish short this year and that will be reflected in next year's allocation for net and sport harvest. The audience raised concerns about the Klamath going over allocation. Sarah Borok responded that each Basin has a sub quota. The total quota was not met because the Trinity quota was not met. The Upper Klamath was based on modeling and the fish just weren't there. The Trinity River hatchery did well this year. It was estimated that 80% of the run was of hatchery origin. There was a good grilse return and 3-year-old return. There were a small number of 3-year-olds on the Klamath. Bogus Creek was very low this year with 3,700 fish. Ron Reed added that the Karuk Tribe tagged one spring Chinook and it made it up Bogus Creek. The percent hatchery component on Bogus Creek is 24.6%. The Shasta River had a low run this year with 833 fish total. The Scott River had the lowest run on record with an estimated return of 445. The Salmon River also had the lowest run on record with 626 fish. Sarah Borok reviewed the spring run for this year. Preliminary findings show it will be the 8th lowest run since 1978. Grilse are up, which is a good sign for an upswing in future years. In summary, smaller runs means smaller allocations next year. Ron Reed asked if these low numbers can be attributed to the juvenile fish die-off in 2001. Sarah Borok responded yes, it could probably be attributed to that event.

Bill John, CDFG, introduced himself and said he has spent most of his career working on the Klamath and Trinity and works out of the Arcata office. He presented information available on coho that was ultimately used for the listing of coho. In 2000, the Fish and Game Commission was petitioned to list coho as a state endangered species. CDFG on the North Coast found that there wasn't any published information after 1991, so they decided to look at unpublished information that would tell them about the status of the species and conduct field surveys in 2001-2002 to determine presence and absence information for 400 streams.

Bill John reported findings of coho in 316/400 streams surveyed. Additionally, it was difficult to find documentation supporting the 400 streams as historic coho streams, so a literature review was conducted and produced documents that described fishery sampling in about 1,400 streams. It was substantiated that about 500 of those had documented coho presence. This data combined, supported a threatened recommendation. Bill showed graphs showing counts over the years that people have used to show the

status of coho populations. Marcia Armstrong noted that Chinook numbers looks grim this year, but some areas look good for coho. Ron Reed added that the Karuk Tribe tagged 17 coho and 9 of them went up to the Scott River, which is promising.

Agendum 7. Updates on anadromous fishery restoration efforts (all members who wish to contribute)

John Engbring stated that there is a handout that lists restoration activities that were funded by the Fish & Wildlife Service throughout the Klamath Basin in 2004 (see agendum 7 handout). He also mentioned the Annual Report that provides abstracts of all the restoration projects that were funded out of the Yreka office and completed in 2004. A copy of that report can be obtained through Laurie Simons.

Julie Perrochet handed out an example of Forest Service restoration projects (see agendum 7 handout). They are big dollar projects that the Forest Service plans to continue into the future. There has been some fish passage funding for anadromous fisheries. The back of the handout reviews road decommissioning projects. Marcia Armstrong asked that this information be posted on the Klamathgroups.org site.

Irma Lagomarsino reported that NOAA Fisheries have funded 12 or 13 State salmon restoration projects and projects with Tribes and Fish & Wildlife Service. Neil Manji stated that this year's CDFG restoration proposals have not been signed-off on by the Director. The RFP process will start for next year's grants and those will be due this May. There might be questions on how much funding from NOAA Fisheries and others CDFG will actually get before projects are approved.

Mike Orcutt stated that the Hoopa Reservation is the largest land based reservation in California. Restoration activities fall under their Forest Management Plan. He listed efforts to reduce cutting that helped anadromous streams. Watershed analyses have been conducted on most major tributaries and a lot of smaller tributaries. As a result of the watershed efforts, the Tribe does harvest timber with its own resources. The Plan also has an evaluation component.

Agendum 8. Public Comment

Steve West, Previous Klamath County Commissioner, stated that his first experience with the Task Force was negative, but he was proved wrong when he actually took the seat on the Task Force. He said it was a pleasure working with everyone involved. Great work is being done by Tribes, landowners and others up and down the Klamath system and those people should be complimented. A fish die-off devastates communities just as much as the Federal government shutting down an irrigation project. Also, when the Federal government breaks promises with veterans and Tribes, those results are devastating. He issued the Task Force a challenge with the time it has left to make it a mission to restore anadromous fish in the Klamath system. There is also a small window of opportunity to restore anadromous fishery from the mouth of the river to the historic habitat through the PacifiCorp Relicensing process.

Agendum 9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group

Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Phil Detrich for Alice Kilham)

Phil Detrich reported that Alice Kilham is working on building relationships and consensus in the Basin by applying the Chadwick process. In November the Crisis to Consensus meeting was in Scott Valley, and last week it met in Klamath, California.

Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter)

Jim Carpenter, Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, stated that there is a major push in the Upper Basin to do watershed assessments in the sub-basins. The Upper Williamson assessment is in draft form

available for final review. An assessment will be done on the Sprague River next. Funding sources are needed for this effort.

A Science Team has been convened in the Upper Basin. The review group consists of stakeholders and it seems to be working well. They are looking at a range of proposals and turning it into a review process. Jim Carpenter continued that the group is working on the CIP with the Bureau of Reclamation. It currently looks like reclamation is in the drivers' seat and the make-up of a stakeholder group is still up for debate. The CIP could provide a role for this group after the Klamath Act expires.

The Upper Basin Working Group has no spending authority or money at this point, but funding for projects through the Fish and Wildlife Office in Klamath Falls is up 100% for 2005 (\$2 million). He listed the future efforts for the Upper Basin Working Group which includes: more coordination between the Upper and Lower Basin and regaining congressional support.

Trinity Management Council (Mike Orcutt)

Mike Orcutt noted that he is not the Executive Director, but reported as a member of the Trinity Management Council. The flow litigation has concluded and the ROD can now be implemented. A remaining challenge is the issue of fall/summer releases. In the past, the Bureau of Reclamation has supplemented flows in July. There has been discussion on coordination and integration of operations. A subcommittee was initiated to see how well the program was implemented last year and the report card wasn't that good. We are behind schedule with Mainstem projects. The initial ROD schedule of completion was 3 years and now it is extended to 2012. Funding is also a big issue. Program implementation was estimated at \$10-13 million, but we were funded at \$10.8 million. Cuts will have to be made because money didn't come in from other sources. Additional dollars are needed for monitoring and mitigation for the flows.

Dave Bitts said he heard last week that there was a CALFED ROD that promised more acre feet to wetlands and the difference would be made up by drawing down the lake. Mike Orcutt responded that his observation is that the CALFED programmatic ROD was signed 8 months before the Trinity and accounted for the ranges of flows in the ROD. Implementation of those initiatives from an operation standpoint is that it is operating with a higher risk factor. The Hoopa are asking that there be provisions for Trinity River water.

Chuck Blackburn mentioned the fish die-off and the flows and that it would make more sense if a larger amount of water was sent down in a smaller amount of time to match-up with the timeframe of first rain. He then talked about Iron Gate Hatchery and if there is a way to stagger releases to take advantage of the fingerlings coming back down. Neil Manji said there has been a lot of discussion about the slug of fish coming out of Iron Gate Hatchery. Early release strategies have been implemented to stagger the fish. There is also a lot of discussion on Trinity flows. Negative affects are being documented. The idea is to get enough water out to trigger movement by water volume or by temperature.

Agendum 10. Report from Technical Work Group (Peter Brucker)

Pete Brucker, TWG, reported on the Technical Working Group's three assignments.

Sub-basin Planning Coordination: The Sub-basin plans have been completed or are moving toward completion. The Lower Basin, Salmon River, Scott River, and Shasta River are in draft form. The Middle Klamath has a final draft, and the Mainstem is not complete. The TWG has been assisting the Sub-basins and implementing the plans. The plans have been helpful, but some people are wondering what is next. On the Mainstem, the TWG has been hearing reports on monitoring and has been able to give good feedback. Flow study help has been provided and we have been reviewing the TMDL process. Work has also been done with the Water Quality Monitoring Group and the Klamath Basin Fish Health

Assessment Team. The Undepleted Flow Report is coming out on the Mainstem and the Task Force should be aware of that. It will provide baseline information for the Hardy Report, but needs to be recalibrated and needs a better feedback loop and more funding.

The Spring Chinook Recovery Program: The Limiting Factors Analysis draft is complete and should be peer reviewed by Peter Moyle and others. The otolith investigations will help identify where limiting factors are. The analysis should be complete within the next year. The TWG will meet in March to draft the Recovery Plan.

Allen Foreman asked about the review of the Undepleted Flow Study. Petey Brucker replied that the Task Force has not formally assigned the TWG to review the study. Allen Foreman added that he would like to see the Task Force play a larger role in the relicensing and the CIP. The idea would be for the Task Force to have a documented statement in all of these processes regardless if it's a neutral position or not. The absence of a statement from this group is a statement in itself.

The group discussed the various entities reviewing the Undepleted Flow Study, the relicensing information, and the CIP. The Task Force agreed that the Undepleted Flow Study is complex and other entities in the Basin are involved who will appropriately comment. Detailed technical comments from the TWG on the Undepleted Flow Study would be an in-depth undertaking. The group agreed to send a letter outlining the need for a more transparent and public process in the Undepleted Flow Study to gain people's confidence. The Yurok is currently working on a similar letter like that and will share it with the Task Force for review and comment.

Assignment: Task Force members will review the draft comment letter on the Undepleted Flow Study and provide comments back to Staff by Friday, February 18th. Staff will send the letter after standard approval from Task Force members.

The Task Force also agreed about the importance of getting on record in the CIP process. They will wait until the CIP is further along in the process to send comments or recommendations. Task Force members should track the progress of the CIP as a group and as individuals.

John Engbring stated that the Task Force is already on the record for the PacifiCorp Relicensing and might want to wait to comment again when the application is deemed ready for environmental analysis.

Accomplishments report: Petey Brucker stated that information is being pulled together for the Accomplishments Report that helps show Congress that the Lower and Upper Basins are very committed. He reviewed the outline for the report and stated that the key accomplishments in the report include the Long Range Plan, the support of the Fish and Wildlife Service to this program, and the establishment of coordination between groups in the Basin. A draft of the report may be available for the Task Force to review in June.

Agendum 11. Report from Budget Committee and decision on 2006 Budget Allocations (Neil Manji). Discussion on Wednesday and Thursday.

Neil Manji reported that the Budget Committee met on November 13 (see agendum 11 handout). Phil Detrich added that this is the last budget of the Task Force in this authorization. In October 2006, the Fish and Wildlife Service office will not have much remaining capacity to deal with projects left over from the past. This budget was designed in the interest of not having projects that carry over to additional years, and to put a cap on the summary of projects that have been accomplished over the years. He reviewed Tables 1 and 2 (see agendum 11 handout) and reminded the group that these numbers are draft.

Details of the proposed budget are on Table 3 (see agendum 11 handout). Phil Detrich reviewed the thinking behind the proposal. The Budget Committee wanted to build capacity in the Sub-basin groups to

continue on without Task Force funding. In the past, \$25,000 has been spread between 5 basins. The proposal is to split that into two and deal with 6 Sub-basins instead of 5. \$30,000 will be allocated to 6 Sub-basins and two coordination groups in the Mid-Klamath.

Details are to be worked out on fish health research. There has also been discussion on the need for ongoing research and monitoring in the Sub-basins, so \$25,000 was allocated to each of the 5 Sub-basins. This also includes \$25,000 for a Sub-basin status report in the Mainstem Klamath.

In the education section, the Budget Committee felt another symposium would be valuable if funding was matched by other sources. \$5,000 was also allocated to support a Chadwick session in 2006. In the research section, ongoing monitoring for harvest management was allocated \$143,000. Finally, the Budget Committee realized that no focus has been placed on the status of the fish and thus, money has been allocated to a report on the status of the fisheries.

John Engbring thanked the Budget Committee for putting this proposal together. He said the Task Force members should identify key priorities for funding. He doesn't think an RFP process is necessary this year. He encouraged folks to talk about this budget tonight for further discussion tomorrow.

Petey Brucker raised TWG concerns about the proposed budget and said energy can be put into the Sub-basin plans and the research instead of ranking. There is probably some need for an RFP for the Mainstem Status Report and the report on the status of fisheries.

Julie Perrochet mentioned the money for a symposium and asked if there is an existing symposium to piggy back on rather than creating another symposium. She then asked if there are RFPs for the research money. Phil Detrich responded that it hasn't been decided, but an option might be to hand that money to the Sub-basins to deal with themselves.

Thursday's Discussion:

John Engbring reinitiated the budget discussion from Wednesday. If there are RFPs to go out, that needs to happen soon. He encouraged discussion between the group members.

Mike Orcutt stated that there seems to be a shift of interest to the Sub-basins. He asked about the differences between the Mainstem and the Mid-Klamath; aren't they one in the same and why is so much money going there. Phil Detrich explained that the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin is huge and is separate from the Mainstem. The Mid-Klamath has dealt with the tributaries from Weitchpec to Iron Gate and is too large an area to be addressed by one group. The Mainstem is one Sub-basin and the Mid-Klamath would be split into two parts in this proposal. This new half needs a Sub-basin plan.

Mike Orcutt raised concern about the Sub-basin projects needing final reports and better coordination after the Task Force is gone. The group discussed what entity is involved with Mid-Klamath work. Marcia Armstrong said that is her Siskiyou County District and there are some plans in effect there. There are several farming operations on the river that are not covered by the Shasta/Scott SSRT and they are falling through the cracks. Allen Vandeberg is interested in working to get the interests together to come up with a plan of action. The Karuk Tribe also does a lot of work that will continue. The \$25,000 for targeted research was identified to help leverage the efforts of the smaller watersheds. Ron Reed added that the Mid-Klamath Watershed Council is involved with management.

John Engbring suggested funding the 5 Sub-basins and asking for an RFP from the Mid-Klamath group. He explained that the targeted research idea on the Mainstem came from the group's consensus that fish health is something important to keep looking at. The targeted research for the Sub-basins was proposed because the Budget Committee felt those entities knew what the money could be used for. Some members agreed with the idea of sending out RFPs and some members thought the TWG should make recommendations in place of sending out RFPs.

Marcia Armstrong said she is concerned that so much money is going to fish health research. Other group members disagreed. Irma Lagomarsino suggested combining the Sub-basin targeted research with the fish health money. Jill Geist would like to see extra money be made available to fish health studies.

Motion by Dave Bitts that the Task Force release a Request for Proposals (RFP) only for the following projects:

- 1) Funding for a coordinator of watershed planning and project development in the upper portion of the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin of the Klamath River Basin. This proposal amount should not exceed \$30,000.**
- 2) Funding for priority research, monitoring, and assessments with emphasis on fish health studies and coho studies. Funding in this category will not exceed \$175,000.**
- 3) Preparation of Reports on: a) Status of Anadromous Fish of the Klamath River (not to exceed \$20,000), or b) Status of Anadromous Fishery Issues of the Mainstem Klamath River (from Upper Klamath Lake to the Estuary and mouth) (not to exceed \$25,000).**

Seconded by Julie Perrochet.

The motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 12. Status of fish health on the Klamath River (J. Scott Foott, FWS Cal-Nevada Fish Health Center and Jerri Bartholomew, Oregon State University)

Scott Foott, Fish & Wildlife Service, introduced himself. He gave an overview of the significant fish diseases in the Klamath Basin and Jerri Bartholomew presented more information on *Ceratomyxa shasta* (*C. shasta*). Scott Foott began by saying the number one fish health issue in the Klamath is Ceratomyxosis due to *C. shasta* infection in juvenile Chinook in the spring and summer. The number two issue is Columnaris in both juveniles and adults. The number three issue is Parvicapsula, which affects kidneys in juveniles. The number four issue is a pancreatic dysfunction that occurs in juvenile Chinook in the spring and summer. Infectious disease is a significant mortality factor for both juvenile and adult salmon in the Klamath Basin, and is far more prevalent in the mainstem than in the tributaries. Elevated water temperatures tend to favor many Klamath River fish pathogens, but infection occurs at relatively mild temperatures (20 C).

Scott Foott reviewed *C. shasta* in detail. There was a 20-50% incidence of *C. shasta* between 1994 and 2001. There is lower incidence in the estuary, but a lot of fish die before getting to the estuary. Steelhead from Iron Gate are quite resistant in comparison with Chinook. As important as the fish die-off was in 2002 for adults, juvenile loss from *C. shasta* exceeds this. Chinook smolt health monitoring will occur this year May 11-July 27.

There is a high rate of incidence of parvicapsula and it is highly widespread in the Pacific Northwest. The disease swells fish's kidneys and over 90% of the fish have this condition. We are unsure how fish recover from this.

Scott Foott reviewed the top three questions researchers are hoping to answer. More attention needs to be paid to the ecology of the alternate polychaete host. The alternate host of the parvicapsula needs to be identified. Finally, the relationship between the length of time fish are holding in the lower river and how that affects disease incidence needs to be examined. In summary, disease is a significant mortality factor for both juveniles and adult salmon in the Basin and is far greater in the Mainstem than in the tributaries. Elevated water temperatures tend to favor many Klamath River fish pathogens but infection occurs at relatively mild temperatures.

Neil Manji asked Scott Foott to go over infection rates and at what level they are considered highly infected. Scott Foott reported that the incidence data is close to the mortality data with *C. shasta*. Dave Hillemeier asked Scott Foott to talk about disease in Trinity River fish. Scott Foott stated that work was

done in 2002 to look at coded wired tags at the estuary. Some fish coming out of the tributaries become infected once they hit the Mainstem. Neil Manji asked about flow issues and the incidence of *C. shasta*. Scott Foott replied that is a huge question and we need a lot of information on this. Health monitoring work will be conducted this year with funding from the Task Force to look at how long spores stay infective. We are also interested in investigating the kidney parasite issue further to determine if fish can recover from infection.

Jerri Bartholomew, Oregon State University, presented on the ecology of the salmonid parasite *C. shasta* in the Klamath River. She has been studying the biology of the parasite and working on the Klamath over the past two years. *C. shasta* is a complex parasite and requires two hosts; a salmonid host and the polychaete host. The parasite takes 2-3 months to develop in the host. The first stage of the parasite is the spore stage and the second stage starts when the fish dies and the spore is released by the polychaete and infects the fish. The parasite infects the intestinal area and is restricted to the Pacific Northwest. It only affects salmonids, but there are some river systems where it has been around for a long time and the species are resistant to a certain point. Chinook seem to have less resistance than usual in the Klamath River and through a certain period of time, exposure seems to increase. A series of studies done in the Deschutes River showed that as the number of exposure days increase, mean day to death decreases.

There are a number of things we don't know about the polychaete host. We suspect that nutrient load affects population densities of the polychaete. They prefer highly productive waters. We don't know if water temperature has effects on the polychaete and their optimal range. It is difficult to separate effects of temperature from water flow. Lower flows concentrate infectious units, and a stable flow regime may favor polychaete abundance and distribution.

Jerri Bartholomew stated that *C. shasta* is detectable in the Klamath River from April-December. She discussed its geographic distribution, using Iron Gate Dam as the upper/lower river divider. There were 22 sentinel exposure study locations and extensive surveys of polychaete habitat were conducted throughout the river, and a sensitivity test for water samples was developed to pinpoint the number of parasites present in certain amounts of water. The prevalence of the parasite in the Upper River was high, but there was lower mortality, which was unusual. It most likely means there is a lower infectious dose in the Upper reaches. The reservoirs had lower numbers because of dilution. In the Lower River, the prevalence was high and mortality was high as well. The parasite was not detected in the tributaries except in Hunter Creek. There was a large difference between mean time of death between the Upper and Lower river because of higher parasite levels. The temporal distribution showed a similar pattern as the spatial distribution.

Jerri Bartholomew reviewed the summary of sentinel results. In the Upper Klamath, mortality occurred in groups in free flowing river sections. Fish became infected in the reservoirs but there was not high degree of mortality. In the Lower Klamath, mortality of rainbow trout was 100% at exposure sites and was high in Chinook. There is an influx into the Klamath between Iron Gate Dam and Beaver Creek. The parasite was detected in a lower level in the Trinity and Hunter's Creek.

Jerri Bartholomew reviewed what is known about the polychaete habitat. It is extremely difficult to work with and there is not a lot of existing data. In general, these polychaetes require some sort of fine sediment. They feed on diatoms. Dissolved oxygen is a limiting factor, and they are robust to things like pH and conductivity. The polychaetes are found in high densities in algae in places like the Keno Reach. Polychaetes were not detected in the JC Boyle Reservoir or sampled reservoirs in general. In summary, polychaetes were found in low to moderate flows, in eddies, and at the inflow to reservoirs. They are likely to have a preference for productive waters and they need fine sand and silt.

Jerri Bartholomew discussed the effects of temperature and desiccation. Lab studies were conducted in aquariums at different temperatures. After three months, at 12 and 5°C there was good survival, and then less survival at 20-25°C. There is probably an upper temperature limit. Also, drying didn't completely

kill them off.

In summary, much work is still to be done to determine ecological requirements of the polychaete host. A lot of what applies to *C. shasta* will also apply to *Parvicapsula*. The tributaries need to be sampled to understand why there are occurrences in certain areas and not others. Temperature, flow, and nutrient effects need to be studied in controlled lab situations. Chinook are susceptible and are contributing a lot of spores back into the system, but we don't know about the other species. In terms of management, we need complete data sets for index sites. There are physical aspects of the river and other existing databases that have information on water flows, detailed polychaete habitat and abundance information and water samples collected over a continual basis. The infection prevalence in the polychaete needs to be studied as well.

Marcia Armstrong encouraged CDFG to explore how this disease affects coho. Scott Foott said coho are susceptible to columnaris, but we don't have information on *C. shasta* for coho. Phil Detrich asked about a hypothesis going around about flushing flows and what would it take to do a study to evaluate that. Jerri Bartholomew replied that flushing out and drying out would work in different situations. Flushing flows would have more affect in the upper part of the river because of the tributaries contributing down lower. Neil Manji asked if there is any information as to why the diseases aren't being seen in the tributaries. Jerri Bartholomew replied that high flushing flows in the winter is one aspect, but it seems to be more of a mainstem issue throughout the Northwest.

13. Public Comment

No public comment.

February 10, 2005

Dan Gale served as the Yurok Tribe alternate for Dave Hillemeier during the February 10 meeting.

Agendum 14. Results of the Scott River 2004/2005 Coho Spawning Surveys (Danielle Quigley, Siskiyou Resource Conservation District)

Danielle Quigley introduced herself and said that coho spawning surveys were completed in mid-January. Surveys began in 2001 with various entities in the Scott River. During that effort, index reaches were set up and those have been surveyed every year since then. About 58 river miles to Callahan Creek were surveyed with many creek tributaries along the way. Naturally disconnected tributaries become the biggest barrier for coho when they come to spawn in the Scott River. The first coho sighting in the Scott River was on October 22nd. The first spawning activity occurred on November 16th in the lower canyon tributaries. December 6-8 brought good rain and the tributaries connected and after that fish were everywhere.

A redd distribution mark and recapture effort took place in Shackleford and French Creeks, Sugar Creek, and the south fork of the Scott. Most spawning occurred in the lower reaches of the tributaries. Danielle Quigley reviewed the extent of spawning distribution and summarized what surveyors found by stream reach. 2001 index reaches were established and she reviewed those. The index reaches have the same amount of fish as three years ago. Compared to other reaches in 2001, fish seem to be better distributed this year. Heavy activity was seen in areas that weren't surveyed three years ago. 80% of the time, there was a coho on the redd, but these numbers are not final. Coho come upstream after the Chinook and coho were not found in places that were surveyed previously, partly because surveys during the past three years were frequent and there was nowhere new to look this year.

Danielle Quigley continued that this year they are planning to take advantage of all the coho and conduct microhabitat utilization studies. Funding was requested for out-migrant trapping on tributaries in the fall and winter. Ron Reed mentioned the Karuk Tribe tagged 17 coho at Ishi Pishi Falls and 9 made it up to

the Scott. He suggested Danielle contact a Karuk biologist to integrate resources and increase efforts.

Agendum 15. Planning for 2005 Klamath Project operations and the Conservation Implementation Program (Rich Piakowski for Dave Sabo, Bureau of Reclamation)

Rich Piakowski introduced himself as a fisheries biologist for the Bureau of Reclamation. He also introduced Ron Costello, a new fisheries biologist for the Bureau of Reclamation who was seated in the audience. He gave a brief update on the hydrologic conditions. As of February, snow pack was 42% of average and inflows as of January are at 61% of average. Currently elevation of Upper Klamath Lake is 4,141.7. It is increasing 0.02 per day and reclamation does not expect the lake to fill. A below average or dry year is expected. 800 cfs is currently being discharged from Iron Gate Dam. NOAA Fisheries and Reclamation are talking every two weeks about Iron Gate releases.

Rich Piakowski gave an update on the waterbank. The goal is to acquire 100,000 acre feet to meet the requirement. Reclamation received 234 applications for dry land idling. The goal is to get enough applications to total 50,000 acre feet of water. No selections have been made and a second bid went out to get more applications on the table for consideration. Reclamation is anticipating dry land purchases of 50,000 acre feet, 35,000 acre feet of groundwater pumping, and 15,000 acre feet for storage, so we need to come up with the 100,000 acre feet. ODWR will help determine where the groundwater will be pumped.

Rich Piakowski reported on the Conservation Implementation Plan (CIP) status. Six public meetings are planned and Reclamation has asked for comments on the draft CIP document. The comment period is closed, but additional comments are welcome. The public comments will be used to complete a third document by the end of March. Following the release of the third draft, more meetings will be planned to finalize the document. The working document remains fluid after it is finished. He mentioned several RFPs including the creation of electronic database for the Basin, a list serve for different resource issues, and a multi-agency monitoring plan for Upper Klamath Lake.

The CIP is planning a Basin-wide water quality workshop later this year to discuss standardizing techniques and how to better share water quality data. Dave Bitts mentioned an existing database created in the lower Basin. Marcia Armstrong suggested looking at standardized water quality protocols that are accepted by the forestry people, so as to look at many techniques. Allen Foreman asked what was being monitored in Upper Klamath Lake. Rich Piakowski said the monitoring plan would put in writing the work that has been done and is currently going on with water quality and endangered suckers.

Agendum 16. Development and Implementation of the Lower Klamath River Sub-basin Watershed Restoration Plan (Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe)

Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe Fisheries Biologist and TWG representative, displayed a map of the Lower Klamath Basin. Land ownership is split between the Forest Service and a private timber company. There is a long legacy of problems from past timber harvesting, resulting in a complete removal of conifers by riparian areas. Several roads lead to large scale mass wasting events. About ten years ago, a restoration effort was started with the timber company, which led to a Sub-basin watershed assessment and ultimately a watershed plan. An effort was made to collect data in the tributaries, which was compiled in a prioritization matrix that ranked the tributaries using 6 parameters. Effective restoration in the Lower Klamath means dealing with the roads, treatment of fish barriers, riparian restoration, instream restoration, proper land management regulations, true involvement by all parties, and a lot funding. He showed a series of before and after pictures from road decommissioning, riparian improvement projects and stream channel work.

Agendum 17. Development and Implementation of the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin Fisheries Resource Recovery Plan (Will Harling, Karuk Tribe)

Will Harling, Karuk Tribe, introduced himself and provided a geographic description of the Mid-Klamath. The Sub-basin is diverse and there are a lot of private land entities. He talked about the Sub-basin Plan background and how it relates to the Long Range Plan. The Long Range Plan came out in 1991 and it took eight or nine years to initiate the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin Plan. He reviewed contents of the plan, comments received during the plan development, and a history synopsis. The Sub-basin Plan Action Plan includes things like upslope restoration, instream restoration, and riparian restoration. Education and communication are also big parts of the Plan. The monitoring plan needs to be addressed more fully to include planning needs and to identify information gaps like identifying diversions. Eight different sub-watersheds were broken out in the 2003 version, which really helped. Each sub-watershed has an in-depth description and restoration action opportunities and several groups implement parts of the Plan. The Karuk Tribe is involved with a lot of the restoration. The Forest Service has also done a lot in the Sub-basin.

Will Harling discussed the need to split the Mid-Klamath in to two sub-basins. The Karuk Tribe wants to expand into the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin. To do that, his responsibility in the Lower Sub-basin needs to be taken over by the Mid-Klamath Watershed Council. We are looking to convene a meeting of all interested Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin stakeholders. The model for the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin is going to be a little different in that we have to get the groups to come to the table and help them embrace the fisheries issues. Phil Detrich asked what it takes to form a watershed council. Will Harling responded that it takes interest from the landowners. There is currently much concern, but no organization. John Engbring asked if there is a group that would put in a proposal if the Task Force were to send out an RFP for the Upper Mid-Klamath Sub-basin. Will Harling said yes, there are several entities that could put in a bid for an RFP.

Agendum 18. Public Comment

No public comment.

Agendum 19. Recap. Assignments and motions will be emailed in two weeks. (John Engbring)

The group agreed to discuss drafting a letter to the Administration regarding the future of the Task Force at the June meeting.

Assignment: Staff will include time for discussion on the drafting of a letter to the Administration regarding the future of the Task Force on the June agenda.

Agendum 20. Future meetings are: June 15-16, 2005 in Yreka; and October 19-20, 2005 in Klamath Falls.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attachment 1

***FINAL AGENDA
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
February 9-10, 2005
Elk Valley Rancheria
Crescent City, California***

February 9, 2005

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 9:00 am | 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair. Vice Chair is Irma Lagomarsino, NOAA Fisheries. Vice Chair for next meeting will be Irma Lagomarsino. |
| 9:15 | 2. Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Approval of minutes a. Adoption of agenda |
| 9:30 | 3. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance |
| 9:45 | 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons) |
| 10:00 | 5. Brief Updates and Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Update on State recovery process (Phil Detrich) b. Update on NOAA recovery planning (Irma Lagomarsino) c. Status of lamprey petition (Phil Detrich) d. Update on Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich) e. Update on Klamath Hydroelectric Project relicensing (Phil Detrich) f. Update on proposed Critical Habitat (Irma Lagomarsino) g. Conference on Science and the Northwest Forest Plan: Knowledge Gained Over a Decade, April 19-20, 2005 (Phil Detrich) |
| 10:30 | 6. Report on the status of Klamath River anadromous fisheries (Neil Manji) |
| 11:00 | Break |
| 11:15 | 7. Updates on anadromous fishery restoration efforts (all members who wish to contribute) |
| 12:00 pm | 8. Public Comment |
| 12:15 | Lunch |
| 1:30 | 9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham) Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Jim Carpenter) Trinity Management Council (Mike Orcutt) |
| 2:00 | 10. Report from Technical Work Group (Peter Brucker) |
| 2:45 | 11. Report from Budget Committee and decision on 2006 Budget Allocations (Neil Manji) |

- 3:15 Break
- 3:30 12. Status of fish health on the Klamath River (J. Scott Foott, FWS Cal-Nevada Fish Health Center and Jerri Bartholomew, Oregon State University)
- 5:00 13. Public Comment
- 5:15 Recess
- 5:30-7:30 pm Social Hour - Join us in the Tsunami Sports Bar & Grill, 760 L Street Crescent City, CA 95531

February 10, 2005

- 8:30 am 14. Results of the Scott River 2004/2005 Coho Spawning Surveys (Danielle Quigley, Siskiyou Resource Conservation District)
- 9:00 15. Planning for 2005 Klamath Project operations and the Conservation Implementation Program (Dave Sabo, Bureau of Reclamation)
- 10:00 Break
- 10:15 16. Development and Implementation of the Lower Klamath River Sub-basin Watershed Restoration Plan (Dan Gale, Yurok Tribe)
- 11:15 17. Development and Implementation of the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin Fisheries Resource Recovery Plan (Will Harling, Karuk Tribe)
- 12:15 18. Public Comment
- 12:30 19. Recap. Assignments and motions will be emailed in two weeks. Identify agenda to include in the next meeting. (John Engbring)
- 12:40 20. Future meetings are: June 15-16, 2005 in Yreka; and October 19-20, 2005 in Klamath Falls.
- Adjourn

Attachment 2

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***February 9-10, 2005
Elk Valley Rancheria
Crescent City, California***

LIST OF HANDOUTS

Agendum 4	Letter to John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force from Sue Ellen Wooldridge regarding The Importance of Funding Fisheries Monitoring in Support of Harvest Management in the Klamath River Basin, dated November 3, 2004.
Agendum 4	Task Force Unspent and Incomplete Projects 3-Years Old and Older, dated January 4, 2005.
Agendum 7	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Restoration Projects.
Agendum 7	2004 Infrastructure Improvement Fund Project Summary.
Agendum 10	Draft letter to Secretary Gale Norton from Dave Hillemeier regarding Comments on the Draft Report entitled, "Undepleted Natural Flow of the Upper Klamath River, dated February 10, 2005.
Agendum 11	Memo to Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force and Technical Work Group Members from Phil Detrich, Field Supervisor, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office regarding Budget Committee Meeting, dated November 30, 2004.
Agendum 14	PowerPoint Presentation on the Results of the Scott River 2004/2005 Coho Spawning Surveys, from Danielle Quigley, Siskiyou Resource Conservation District.
Informational	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Membership list, dated February 2, 2005.
Informational	Conference on Science and the Northwest Forest Plan: Knowledge Gained Over a Decade, dated April 19-20, 2005.
Informational	Press Release regarding President's Budget Reaffirms Commitment to Klamath Basin, dated February 3, 2005.

Attachment 3***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***

***February 9-10, 2005
Elk Valley Rancheria
Crescent City, California***

LIST OF ATTENDEES

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Crescent City, California, on the dates indicated:

February 9, 2005

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
E.B. Duggan	Trinity River Guides and Sportsmen
Jim Carpenter	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Stephanie Carpenter	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Steve West	West Consulting Groups
Laura West	West Consulting Groups
Dan Burgess	Rural Human Services Stream Habitat Improvement
Mike Plomateer	Karuk Tribe
Giovanni Vadurro	Laco Associates
Jason Buck	Laco Associates
Mike Long	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Joseph Jarnaghan	Hoopa Tribal Council
Elwood Miller	Klamath Tribes
Jerry Barnes	Klamath River Technical Advisory Team
Sara Borok	California Department of Fish and Game
Petey Brucker	Technical Work Group
Jim Waldvogel	Technical Work Group
Paul Van Mecheleu	Yurok Tribe
Scott Foott	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jerri Bartholomew	Oregon State University

February 10, 2005

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Mike Polmateer	Karuk Tribe
Steve West	West Consulting Group
Laura West	West Consulting Group
Joseph Jarnaghan	Hoopa Tribal Council
James Tulloch	UK/Scottish Press
Rich Piaskowski	Bureau of Reclamation
Jeff Mitchell	Klamath Inter-Tribal Fish & Water Commission
Will Harling	Karuk Tribe
William McCarey	Yurok Tribe
Felice Pace	Yurok Tribe

Attachment 4

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

*February 9-10, 2005
Elk Valley Rancheria
Crescent City, California*

MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Motions:

Agendum 2a

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the October minutes.
Seconded by Allen Foreman.
Motion passed. Mike Orcutt abstained.

Agendum 2b

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.
Seconded by Chuck Blackburn.
Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 11

Motion by Dave Bitts that the Task Force release a Request for Proposals (RFP) only for the following projects:

- 1) Funding for a coordinator of watershed planning and project development in the upper portion of the Mid-Klamath Sub-basin of the Klamath River Basin. This proposal amount should not exceed \$30,000.
- 2) Funding for priority research, monitoring, and assessments with emphasis on fish health studies and coho studies. Funding in this category will not exceed \$175,000.
- 3) Preparation of Reports on: a) Status of Anadromous Fish of the Klamath River (not to exceed \$20,000), or b) Status of Anadromous Fishery Issues of the Mainstem Klamath River (from Upper Klamath Lake to the Estuary and mouth) (not to exceed \$25,000).

Seconded by Julie Perrochet.
The motion passed unanimously.

Assignments:

Agendum 4

Staff will include time for discussion on the letter from Sue Ellen Wooldridge regarding additional funding for future monitoring of fisheries in the Klamath Basin on the June agenda.

Agendum 5a

Staff will include a presentation by CDFG on the incidental take permit process on the June agenda. Neil Manji will provide a speaker.

Agendum 10

Task Force members will review the draft comment letter on the Undepleted Flow Study and

provide comments back to Staff by Friday, February 18th. Staff will send the letter after standard approval from Task Force members.

Agendum 19

Staff will include time for discussion on the drafting of a letter to the Administration regarding the future of the Task Force on the June agenda.